

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species 1 in the reply filed on 1/28/10 is acknowledged.

### ***Specification***

2. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There are numerous phrases and clauses in the claims that are vague, indefinite, and/or awkwardly and confusingly worded, and therefore, are not fully understood. The following are examples:

Claim 7, line 5: "fluid" lacks positive antecedent basis.

Claim 7, line 6: Is "a path of another fluid" referring to "two or more separate fluids" or another fluid not part of "two or more separate fluids"?

The claims do not conform to the standard US method format.

Art Unit: 3726

Claims are ambiguous and competitors would be unable to discern the bounds of the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 7, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Engstrom et al (US 4,249,597).

Re claim 7: Carey discloses providing a plurality of stacked plates which limit heat exchange of two or more separate fluids across said plates, said plates each including a double wall configuration to prevent fluid from leaking through a wall of the plates and entering a path of another fluid (col. 1, lines 5-6), the double walls of each of said plates being sealingly interconnected around borders of port holes in the plates, wherein each plate of the stacked plates, prior to being brazed, is provided with brazing material on a surface thereof which engages a surface of another plate of said stacked plates (22), and wherein areas of mutually contacting wall surfaces of two of said plates forming a double wall plate around borders of a port hole are configured to only partly cover each other (28).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

8. Please provide reference numerals (either in parentheses next to the claimed limitation or in a table format with one column listing the claimed limitation and another column listing corresponding reference numerals in the remark section of the response to the Office Action) to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity (optional). Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick K. Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4564. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM to 1:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3726

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rick K. Chang/  
Primary Examiner, A.U.

3726

RC  
April 15, 2010